



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Councilmember Sally Clark, Chair, COBE Committee  
Councilmember Sally Bagshaw  
Councilmember Tim Burgess

**FROM:** Diane M. Sugimura, DPD, Director  
Jeff Davis, DPD, Finance and Budget Manager

**DATE:** February 18, 2010

**SUBJECT:** February 24 Committee Discussion: DPD's Proposed Fee Ordinance Changes,  
Comparison of Subject to Field Inspection Fees

At the February 3<sup>rd</sup> Committee of the Built Environment meeting we briefed you on DPD's proposal to modify what the department charges for Subject to Field Inspection (STFI) permits. DPD is proposing to add a plan review component to STFI permits at 40% of what would be charged for this work with a typical building permit. This fee increase recognizes that the department is currently not recovering costs incurred in providing plan review services for STFI permit applicants.

At the committee meeting you asked us to report back to you with information on what other jurisdictions charge applicants for similar permits. Comparisons across cities can be difficult due to variations in how the jurisdictions provide the services, the types of projects that are exempt, and the level to which the fees are subsidized. That said, we believe the information provided below provides a meaningful comparison of what applicants are charged across jurisdictions.

Most STFI permits are for relatively small projects. To make comparisons across jurisdictions we have picked two representative project sizes, those valued at \$10,000 and \$50,000.

Building Projects valued at \$10,000	
Jurisdiction	Permit Fee
<b>Seattle (current fee)</b>	<b>262.50</b>
Spokane	292.05
Renton	357.64
<b>Seattle (revised fee)</b>	<b>367.50</b>
Bellevue	387.04



<b>Building Projects valued at \$50,000</b>	
<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Permit Fee</b>
<b>Seattle (current fee)</b>	762.50
Spokane	1,026.30
<b>Seattle (revised fee)</b>	1,067.50
Renton	1,148.40
Bellevue	1,352.74

*Note – Portland and Tacoma were also evaluated but excluded from this summary because their fees are too site specific and have too many variables to make meaningful comparisons.*

We believe that the proposed increase is both necessary to recover the costs of providing service and, as this summary shows, is comparable with similar jurisdictions. Please let us know if we can provide you with any further information on this matter. Thank you.